

# PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF TISBURY  
P.O. BOX 602  
TOWN HALL ANNEX  
VINEYARD HAVEN, MASSACHUSETTS 02568  
(508) 696-4270  
Fax (508) 696-7341  
www.tisburyma.gov

## MEETING MINUTES

**DATE:** January 5, 2022

**TIME:** 5:01 PM

**PLACE:** Due to ongoing efforts to prevent spread of Covid-19 this meeting will be held remotely via Zoom platform. The Public can attend and participate in the meeting by the following method:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/98381825194> Meeting ID: 983 8182 5194

One tap mobile

+16468769923,,98381825194# US (New York)

**ATTENDANCE:** Bellante-Holand, Doble, Robinson, Alexander, Miller and Munafo

**MINUTES:** As referred in the December 15, 2021, Meeting Agenda

### APPOINTMENTS:

5:01 PM Board Discussions

Attendance: Judi Barrett, Barrett Group; Adam Turner, Exec. Dir.- MVC

#### Master Plan

Board members were advised that C. Doble, D. Bellante Holand and J. Grande met with J. Barrett to discuss the allocation of the budget, based on the phases of the scope of work. C. Doble screen shared an outline of the Master Plan's Scope of Work that was discussed.

C. Doble explained that they focused on Phases II and III. Phase II included two topics: Vision and Goals, and Formulation of Master Plan Concepts and Area Plans. She explained that the Planning Board was interested in developing area plans for the three business districts, but that the consultant was interested in soliciting additional information about the level of detail for the plans. C. Doble added that she had suggested that the Planning Board could update the 2005 Vision plan and goals for the project that will have to include climate change, and new issues raised by the large-scale developments they were reviewing. She asked Board members if they should update the vision plan and add topics such as climate change to realign the plan to existing

conditions or embark on a more in-depth study. The most important question for the Board is to decide on the level of detail they would like for the area plans, because it would help Ms. Barrett develop an estimate for this section of the budget.

J. Barrett came prepared to illustrate samples of area plans she had developed for other communities of varying detail that she felt could be incorporated into a Master Plan for the Board's consideration. She screen shared an area plan for the Town of Upton entitled "Upton Center Visioning Project – Open Space, Recreation & Connectivity Improvements. J. Barrett explained that it was not designed with a lot of detail because it was basically a visual (plan) markup of the town center area that detailed the improvements. In other illustrations, they added numbers that correlated with a summary of the improvements in other pages (e.g., story map). It was a similar format utilized to illustrate models (to scale) of the proposed revisions and overall vision.

In her opinion, the level of detail illustrated in the maps they reviewed were of an appropriate level of documentation and visualization for a Master Plan that was aimed at addressing critical issues affecting the whole town as opposed to the neighborhood plans that were prepared for larger towns.

D. Bellante Holand thought the neighborhood plan they were viewing appeared detailed enough for the three commercial districts in town, which could be viewed as neighborhoods due to their scale. The districts were somewhat complex, so that she wondered if the scale of implementation would also give them ability to make decisions and make the necessary changes. J. Barrett reiterated that it would be appropriate for a town using the three commercial districts as a window into the issues impacting the town. She added that when they embark on a true area plan or focused neighborhood plan there will be architectural plans that go beyond the scope of work or more detailed stormwater plans, etc. They were focusing on the key issues for this area. It was possible that they may require more specific information for actionable items, but she did not have that information now.

D. Bellante-Holand wanted to understand how they were going to fold in stormwater into the plan and the type of detail they needed to be able to do this.

E. Miller wanted to recommend that they made sure the town administrator, town officials and constituents were notified of the hotspots as they are uncovered to avoid any surprises about the need for potentially additional studies (and cost). D. Bellante-Holand inquired if E. Miller agreed that the first level of details was appropriate, understanding that they may have to drill into more detail later down the road to address the hot spots. E. Miller replied in the affirmative. J. Barrett noted that it was always the case, so that it can be phased in the analysis of the master plan.

C. Alexander did not just want the Master Plan to report the issues, but to provide an implementation plan with details about the responsible parties, timeframe and anticipated budget (and potential for funding). She inquired if this was included in the scope of the project and budgetary breakdown, she provided the Board. J. Barrett noted that the level

of detail the Board preferred for area plans was not customarily developed for master plans.

B. Robinson noted that there were other aspects they were interested in such as guidance for developers and applicants. He hoped there was level of guidance pertaining to scale, public amenities. He thought the BI and WC were essentially one district, so that they were really dealing with only two commercial districts. He felt that at some point they would be diagramming the districts to help the community see the physical changes. He added that the BII district was quite small and the one most studied so that there is much information available about the district.

C. Doble thought the first diagram with the additional text that flushed out the issues was a good place to be. She asked J. Barrett if they could have the level of detail illustrated on the screen shared plan within the proposed budget. J. Barrett believed they could do the three vision plans, the inventory and assessment work on all of the elements and update the existing vision plan with the existing funds from the two sources. She could not get into the detailed implementation program or draft the final master plan. They had to be done separately due to the amount of work (stakeholder interviews and meetings). As far as they could go was to draft recommendations for all the elements and design the three different vision plans. She offered to scope out the work they've just discussed.

B. Robinson noted that the town and the MV Commission had commissioned several studies on different issues that may be helpful so that there was an abundant amount of information. J. Barrett indicated that she has been looking at the content of the information and was aware of the volumes of information but noted that they were not all done in the same year, so that some of the data had to be updated.

E. Miller thought a list of projected studies would be helpful to share with their constituents.

C. Doble asked J. Barrett to share an example of an implementation plan for their budget. She thought it would be helpful. She asked for a link to the plan, that she could share with the Board members.

C. Alexander noted that in J. Barrett's proposal for Phase III included a section entitled Policy Development - Implementation Program. She asked if there would be a small element of the implementation program in the draft Master Plan. J. Barrett clarified that it would be going to be a draft implementation (not a fully detailed implementation program), because it would require additional work and funding. C. Doble inquired if the plan included policy recommendations. J. Barrett replied that it was a requirement.

D. Bellante Holand noted that C. Doble had requested a revised draft for Phase III from J. Barrett. If they were looking for additional funds for the level of detail they discussed, she wanted J. Barrett to provide the Board an idea of the cost.

Attendance: Alex Elvin, Ross Seavey, Russell

A. Turner noticed over the last few years the town and the MV Commission have reviewed large scale projects that not only impacted their sites but larger areas such as Downtown, Main Street, Five Corners, etc. Applicants were being asked for traffic studies to look at and resolve the same issues with traffic, parking, etc. He thought they could save themselves and the applicant time if they collaborated and utilized one traffic planner such as K. Fraser or Howard, Stein, Hudson to look at all of the studies in a broader sense as opposed to the individual sites and to tie them together to get a better understanding of the whole area.

He was thinking of approaching K. Fraser, since he had completed the peer review for Main Street Medicinals is conducting the traffic study for Educomp and possibly doing a peer review of the 70-seat restaurant. He wanted to combine all the background elements of the independent studies together and combine them to create a model they could use for future proposals. The modeling gave them the advantage of adding these elements to new proposals or taking them out as needed to obtain a clearer picture of the situation. It would provide them a broader perspective.

D. Bellante-Holand recalled that the Board has had discussions on the subject in the past and the need to have a broader and comprehensive perspective on projects in lieu of the segmented views. She thought it was a sound concept and assumed that the Board members would agree. The one item she wanted to raise was the importance in having actual numbers and not the projections they've been provided based on standards or formulas that did not apply to the Vineyard. She asked A. Turner if he had any ideas to move this forward.

A. Turner mentioned that the MV Commission had taken traffic counts at various locations in the past year to look at any changes in traffic generation or traffic patterns that were specific to the Vineyard. He was willing to have M. Mauro, traffic planner and the MVC's traffic consultant assist in this project. A. Turner felt they had to pursue this from a broader perspective if they were going to be fair in their policies.

D. Bellante-Holand noted that they normally established a 53G account to hold funds on the applicants' behalf to cover the expense of the study(ies). A. Turner indicated that the MV Commission had a similar system in place when they charge the applicant for the study. If the Planning Board was supportive of the concept, he offered to define a scope of work that was acceptable to both parties and decide on the consultant to do the work. The MV Commission would help pay for a major part of the work.

D. Bellante-Holand wanted to clarify if she understood A. Turner correctly to say that they were looking to establish a scope of work to create a recent traffic study for a larger section, by pulling recent traffic surveys as well as identifying areas of concern that have not been studied, studying these areas and utilizing our consultants to tie the information together with funding to be provided by the applicant and other sources.

A. Turner replied that it was generally correct. The advantage was that the applicant would be asked for the same information from both the Planning Board and MV Commission.

C. Alexander was interested in addressing the gaps in the traffic studies, the sections in town that have never been studied, such as the intersection of State Road, Edgartown Road and Look Street. A. Turner replied in the affirmative. She supported the proposal.

E. Miller thought it was important to include 5 Corners and the sidewalks in Educomp's study and supported A. Turner's proposal.

Board members were asked how they should initiate the project, if they had just contracted K. Fraser to perform a traffic study for X. Agassipour. A. Turner indicated that he wanted to fold R. Dunn's traffic study into Educomp's study, then move forward on a more comprehensive look at the entire downtown area for parking, traffic flow, etc.

B. Robinson noted that there were a few time horizons that they had to look at such as the regulatory review, and the Master Plan project. He felt they had to segment them out and establish a reasonable timeframe to address them. A. Turner replied that they were going to fold R. Dunn's study into Educomps, use their consultants for a peer review of Educomp's study then arrange for a short-term comprehensive look of all the studies for the DRI.

B. Robinson felt the information will lead to policy changes that could be dealt with by the Master Plan. A. Turner noted that he was discussing short term and long-term perspectives that he could refine in the draft scopes. They had to appreciate that they were reviewing applications for which they had studies or were in the process of completing their traffic studies which were impacting the areas of concern that they could not ignore and would be acting on.

D. Bellante-Holand asked A. Turner how the current discussions impacted R. Dunn's application. A. Turner indicated that the MV Commission had requested a traffic study of him. He offered to approach the Planning Board on his behalf to inquire if they would have any objection to contacting K. Fraser to do his study in case it led to some cost savings to him. The MV Commission was going to pay for a portion of the fee.

D. Bellante-Holand asked A. Turner if he was interested in scheduling a work session with the Planning Board to discuss this further. A. Turner wanted to meet with the Board within a week and offered to write up a draft scope by the end of this week.

C. Doble noted that she was going to advise Mr. Dunn that the Planning Board supported A. Turner's proposal and anticipated receiving a draft scope that pulled P. Lyon's and Agassipur's (Educomp) study together. She clarified that the Board did not ask R. Dunn for a traffic study because they understood that the MV Commission had already requested one of him in November at the LUPC meeting.

## MEETING MINUTES CONT.

JANUARY 5, 2022

6:02 PM Public Hearing (Cont.): Special Permit Application for Patrick T. Lyons Family Trust, 16 Union Street, AP 07D10  
Attendance: iPhone Guest (6:01P), Ben Hall Jr (6:12P), Ross Seavey, M. Nicotera, Oraibi Voumard

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:02 PM. Planning Board Chairman, D. Bellante-Holand deferred to the lead member on this application, C. Doble to direct the discussions on the Board's behalf.

C. Doble noted that she had shared Mr. Dunn's responses to an email she and P. Munafo had sent requesting additional information. She had sent Mr. Dunn an additional email requesting a clarification and/or further details on some of his responses. She asked the applicant if he had the additional information for tonight's continuation.

R. Dunn was prepared to provide a screen share of the proposal, but C. Doble preferred that he focused on the information that was requested. She asked that while she understood the restaurant may have off-season operations, she inquired about the days, hours, staffing, duration.

R. Dunn replied that there was a possibility that Mr. Lyons may have take-out during the off-season, but the applicant did not make that decision. C. Doble noted that applicants have provided the information to avoid from returning to amend their decision. C. Alexander explained that they understood the situation, what they were asking was "if they were opened what would the operations be". R. Dunn thought they would provide dinners only and offer take-out until 8P or 9P. He assumed they'd have two to three staff members in the kitchen.

C. Doble indicated that she inquired if the applicant could identify who approved the diagram for the drainage under the deck. R. Dunn replied that the MV Commission approved the concept for direct percolation for the stormwater. He believed the Planning Board did as well. For this proposal, he did not have a storm water facility. The percolation rate in the area was 12" per hour. His idea was to send a diagram reflecting a method he has used in the past successfully, which was to deliver the water from the roofs to the gravel he planned to add to the sandy soils underground. C. Doble clarified for the record that the MV Commission approved the concept of direct percolation. R. Dunn replied in the affirmative.

C. Doble noted that there was a revision in the labeling of the buildings and wanted to make sure that the Planning Board received the revised and corrected plans for their files. C. Doble added that the pull-off for the deliveries was not added on the plans the Board received. She wanted to make sure that the information was added to the plan as well as the easement behind the restaurant. She did not see a graphical representation (or labeled) on the plans. R. Dunn indicated that they were both on the condominium site plan and restaurant site plan. He explained that there was a 12 ft wide area from the entry point for pedestrian use, deliveries, and ambulances. C. Doble reiterated that she was asking the applicant to delineate and label both the pull-off and easement. R. Dunn believed this was included in the latest renditions he sent the Board.

C. Doble noted that they were also asking for stamped drawings. Board staff clarified that the Board was asking for the type of plans he had to submit for the building department for a building permit. R. Seavey thought the outdoor spaces for the restaurant would be certified by a landscape architect. Additional discussions ensued and R. Dunn noted that he was a registered architect in Washington DC, but not in Massachusetts. B. Robinson thought it was important for the Board to have a stamped copy of the survey delineating the space for the restaurant and bounds. They've already seen unstamped plans for the previous proposal, so that they were not essential for this application.

C. Doble requested that the three parking spaces be delineated on the site plan. R. Dunn noted that they were on another site plan and exclusive to Unit 8. She offered to accept a reference to the three parking spaces on a revised plan. She also asked for copies of his agreements with Bruno's and IGI confirming their ability to manage the anticipated volume of waste and compost. R. Dunn indicated that he had submitted a letter from Bruno's. C. Doble did not find the letter was clear. She further noted that the Board did not receive a letter from IGI. C. Doble asked if the composting totes were secured and locked to prevent them from becoming an unattractive nuisance.

C. Doble noted that the Planning Board had a conversation with A. Turner earlier in the evening at which time it was confirmed that the MV Commission had requested a traffic study of R. Dunn. A. Turner was thinking of combining Mr. Lyon's traffic study with Educomp's study to save on time and quite possibly on cost. She understood that A. Turner would be contacting him to discuss this. R. Dunn indicated that he has been discussing the matter with A. Turner.

C. Alexander recalled that the applicant submitted a site plan by SB&H Inc. dated 12/6/2021 as part of his application and noted that while it included the two new structures, and the drive-through, it did not delineate any of the spaces for the restaurant, walks, etc. She asked the Board if it was the type of information that should have been included in the site plan for this application? She assumed that it was the information they needed for the application, other than the sketches that have been provided. C. Doble replied in the affirmative. C. Alexander added that the plan should also include the dimensions (e.g., width of the sidewalks, height of canopies, size of platform, easement, etc.) B. Robinson thought all he had to do was to delineate the walkways, public space and areas for the restaurant for their approval. E. Miller added that she would also like to schedule a site visit.

B. Robinson was still unclear about the recycling component. They have not been provided with any information about how the composting was going to work. Most of the compost containers were going to end up as part of their waste stream. He wanted to understand how the applicant was proposing to decrease the waste stream for this type of restaurant as opposed to the more traditional facility that washes all of the dinnerware, and glassware. B. Robinson recommended looking into the use of a high temp washing machine to decrease the need to use large quantities of a hand sanitizer. R. Dunn noted that in the recently revised submittal they were no longer using composting material but a biodegradable paper product. They were washing the glasses and cutlery. He further added that they now used 1 gallon of

water per cycle so that they were not using as much water as normally expected with fast food establishments.

B. Robinson inquired if R. Dunn was contemplating the installation of a water meter for the kitchen. R. Dunn replied that he was installing a meter in every unit.

D. Bellante Holand wanted to bring up the one concern she had with the use pertaining to the waste. She understood that they were going to have bussers in the outdoor dining area, but when she looked at the fast turnover rate and windy conditions of the area, she questioned whether he would have sufficient staff to manage the trash from blowing around and littering the area. R. Dunn explained that he decided against having trash receptacles in the dining area because of the potential abuse. He did not want to rely on the patrons to clean up after themselves, so R. Dunn was going to rely on the bussers and food runners. R. Dunn noted that they were going to have three food runners service the 70 seats. He thought the bar tender may help. D. Bellante-Holand questioned whether he had sufficient staff, and if the bar tender would be able to assist if he was serving drinks to the ten (10) seats at the bar. R. Dunn clarified that the bussers and food runners were the same individuals and just bringing food to the tables, and the trash once the patrons finished. D. Bellante Holand inquired if the bar tender delivered drinks to the tables. R. Dunn replied in the affirmative. She inquired if they planned to have more than one bartender. R. Dunn did not know. D. Bellante Holand did not think one bartender could serve the ten (10) seats at the bar and deliver drinks to the tables if they were anticipating a high turnover rate. She thought the applicant may have to reconsider their business plan and hire more staff so that they are not overwhelmed or have trash flying around in the area.

B. Hall submitted an email expressing his comments and concerns and assumed the Board had reviewed his email. He did not want to be construed as being in opposition of the project given its size and location because he favored the proposal. Understanding that certain aspects of the proposal fall within the jurisdiction of other town boards, such as wastewater and alcohol. He wanted to bring to the Planning Board's attention that the applicant was required to have a full-service, sit-down restaurant to serve alcohol. The wastewater use for a full service restaurant is 35 gallons per day, not the 15 gallons per seat per day assigned fast food restaurants. He urged the Board to review his email again because it explained the issues he noted in the proposal.

D. Bellante Holand notified B. Hall that the alcohol license was not part of the proposal or within the Board's jurisdiction. As such it required a separate application to the Select Board. She asked B. Hall to limit his comments/questions about the proposal that lie within the Planning Board's address. B. Hall believed the applicant was proposing a full service, alcohol serving restaurant so that the Planning Board was required to make sure that applicant met all of the town's requirements before issuing him a decision. He was also concerned that the applicant did not provide a handicap accessible bathroom for both genders or a separate bathroom for employees. He assumed that the applicant would have to apply for waivers, but he has not seen an application. He felt that the Building Commissioner was going to have to take a closer look at this issue prior to construction

TISBURY PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES CONT.  
JANUARY 5, 2022

9

phase. He hoped these issues are not overlooked and felt the regulations did not allow the proposed use.

There being no further comment, D. Bellante-Holand recommended continuing the hearing and deferred to staff. P. Harris recommended February 16, 2022 at 6:45 PM. P. Munafo moved to continue the hearing on February 16, 2022 at 6:45 PM. C. Alexander seconded the motion, which carried: m/s/c 5/0/0 R. Dunn left the meeting at 6:49 PM

6:50 PM Public Hearing (Cont.): Special Permit Application for MCLC Family Limited Partnership, 5 McClellan Way, AP 19A21.4  
Attendance: Mark Nicotera, Oraibi Voumard, Linda Ziegler, Ross Seavey

Hearing commenced in due form at 6:50 PM. Planning Board Chairman notified the Board that the applicant's representative, Mark Nicotera had submitted a written request, dated January 3, 2022 for a continuation on February 16, 2022.

D. Bellante-Holand asked M. Nicotera if the date provide him sufficient time. She also asked M. Nicotera to notify the Board if he'll need another extension at least a week in advance.

D. Bellante-Holand recommended continuing the hearing on February 16, 2022 at 6PM. And entertained a motion from the Board. P. Munafo so moved. C. Alexander seconded the motion, and the motion carried: m/s/c 5/0/0

The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 6:53 PM

7:17 PM Public Hearing: Special Permit Amendment by Jim Feiner, AP 24A19  
Attendance: Oraibi Voumard, Ross Seavey

Hearing commenced in due form at 7:17 PM. Planning Board Chairman read the public hearing notice into the minutes as it was screen shared for the Board. O. Voumard confirmed that he would be representing the applicant. J. Feiner at the hearing.

Board members were informed that the applicant, per letter of application was requesting an amendment of the Board's 01/20/2021 Special Permit. The Board Chairman clarified that he was asking the board to revise Condition No. 15 which required cedar shingles for the exterior of the building. The applicant had installed vertical barnboard, which was painted red.

D. Bellante Holand asked that the photos the applicant submitted reflecting the improvements (barnboard and red paint) be screen shared. O. Voumard explained that the two photos on the left reflected the view of the structure from the road. The applicant offered to shingle the façade and to re-paint the building a driftwood gray (solid color stain).

D. Bellante Holand asked Board staff to screen share the color of the stain the applicant was proposing. P. Harris screen shared a photo of the red stained barn board and color palette for solid color stains. P. Munafo noted that the exterior material was not barnboard, but T1-11.

O. Voumard stood corrected. He explained that the first layer was T1-11. He's placed shiplap vertical barn board to cover the building. P. Munafo inquired if the Building Commissioner has inspected the property to confirm the use of the materials. R. Seavey replied in the negative. D. Bellante Holand asked O. Voumard if he knew when they changed materials. O. Voumard could not respond since he had just started working on the renovation. He assumed that it occurred approximately one year ago.

There being no further questions or comments, D. Bellante Holand was willing to entertain a motion from the Board members. D. Bellante Holand thought it was unfortunate to be placed in this position. She thought the Planning Board's decision was very clear so that the applicant's failure to comply with the conditions of the decision has led the applicant to request a second reprieve from their regulations. Although she felt this had the potential for setting a bad precedent, she was open to the Planning Board members decision.

O. Voumard informed the Board that he had been trying to secure the shingles for this project and managed to secure enough to shingle the façade of the building. It was difficult to obtain. C. Alexander understood from P. Munafo that the shingles were extremely difficult to obtain, and so she inquired if they could issue the applicant a timeframe e.g., two years by which to shingle the entire exterior of the building. Board staff noted that it would encumber the building commissioner because he'd have to monitor the applicant's progress and confirm the applicant's compliance with the new deadline. It was also uncertain as to how this would affect his permitting process.

R. Seavey indicated that he could issue a temporary certificate of occupancy that could be extended every 6 months until the applicant complied with the decision. During this time the applicant could still rent the structure. He explained the other options that were available to the applicant, but the final decision was the Planning Board's to make. He felt the application itself was very interesting.

P. Munafo strongly felt the entire building should be shingled, bearing in mind the supply issues. He understood the situation being a carpenter himself.

E. Miller wanted to enter a motion to have the applicant shingle the entire building. She felt the applicant knew the regulations, had ample time to comply with the decision, and violated the regulations.

B. Robinson felt the Board should put aside the history and look at the more practical aspect of the proposal. They were in the middle of a housing crisis, and to hold up a potential living unit because of their concern for the exterior material did not appear practical. He understood about the façade, but to require the applicant to shingle the other three sides when they were already improved and painted seemed excessive. He did not think they should be punitive but practical.

R. Seavey explained that he could issue the applicant a full certificate of occupancy if he complied with the building code and decision. If he did not comply with the Board's decision, he could issue the applicant a temporary certificate of occupancy, so that a tenant

could move in that day. The applicant would still be required to comply with the Board's Decision before he was issued a full certificate of occupancy. Based on other construction projects requiring shingles, it was his opinion that the applicant had sufficient time to secure the shingles.

B. Robinson asked if he could see the original text regarding the siding. Board staff screen shared Condition No. 15.

E. Miller moved to deny the change in the special permit. Board members did not second the motion.

B. Robinson moved to accept the applicant's request to shingle the roadside façade and leave the other sides as improved. C. Alexander recommended amending his motion to state that the color had to be changed to a driftwood gray. R. Seavey noted that the existing red stain would be difficult to cover and asked that the Planning Board assume the responsibility of approving the final finished product.

Board staff asked for a clarification of the exterior color. C. Doble felt they had to make sure the gray stain covered the red. O. Voumard offered to apply a primer to make sure it matched the color of the house. D. Bellante Holand asked B. Robinson to modify his motion to respond to the board's concerns.

B. Robinson moved to modify his motion to allow the applicant to shingle the façade of the building facing the road, leave the remaining exterior walls with the shiplap barnboard, and use a grey stain over the red, which was to be approved by a Planning Board member after its stained. P. Munafo seconded the motion.

D. Bellante Holand roll called the Board: Robinson, Doble, and Alexander voted in favor of the motion. Miller and Bellante Holand voted against the motion. m/s/c 3/2/0

D. Bellante Holand moved to close the hearing and to open the deliberations on January 19, 2022 at 7 PM. C. Alexander so moved. E. Miller seconded the motion and the motion carried. 5/0/0

The Planning Board resumed their regularly scheduled session at 7:47 PM.

## **BOARD DISCUSSIONS:**

### **A. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **1. Master Plan RFQ**

##### **A. Press Releases**

##### **B. Steering Committee Draft Application**

##### **C. Webpage**

D. Bellante Holand noted for the record that she had emailed the Board in advance of the meeting an update and documents with a request for comments by Sunday. She was also interested in hearing about the characteristics of the steering committee members and job description for the Master Plan Administrator.

C. Doble felt the Board had to be clear about the steering committee members' role. They were not producing the Master Plan. The Committee members were involved in the process, meeting with the consultants to share their feedback on the materials. At the Chairman's request a copy of the Master Plan Steering Committee Application was screen shared for the Board's review and edits.

C. Doble recommended revising the documents to eliminate the reference stating the committee would be drafting the Master Plan in the draft application and press release.

E. Miller noted that she had submitted her comments to D. Bellante Holand. Board Chairman did not have the opportunity to read E. Miller's comments and asked that she enter them as they reviewed the documents.

D. Bellante Holand noted the first sentence in the draft application did state that they were drafting the master plan. She asked C. Doble to clarify what the steering committee members were going to do. C. Doble replied that they were meeting with the consultants, provide feedback on draft materials, facilitate outreach to the community, identify stakeholders, etc.

E. Miller thought the committee was going to serve as the liaisons to the Planning Board, the consultants and community. B. Robinson thought they could add language indicating that their skill sets and expertise would be advantageous in providing feedback to the consultants. E. Miller concurred and added experience. C. Alexander noted that it was important to have the diversity to be representative of the community. D. Bellante Holand revised the first sentence in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph to read as "The Steering Committee will be active and engaged in the process of developing the first Tisbury Master Plan", and adding the Board's comments about skill sets, expertise and experience.

D. Bellante Holand asked the Board if they felt the 02/04/22 application deadline was realistic. C. Doble noted that it would give applicants three weeks, if the press release was published next week. C. Alexander inquired if they were publishing the notice for two weeks.

D. Bellante Holand thought they should provide both newspapers the press release, schedule an appointment with the Select Board to present their progress, drop off applications at various town buildings, and set up their website. C. Doble recommended contacting Amy Ryan and John Custer to help disseminate the information to their subscribers, and school parents. They could communicate with members of the vision forum group via email.

C. Doble recalled that the Planning Board still had to finalize the scope of the project and its timing with the consultant, so that they may not need a committee right away. It was a subject they should discuss with the consultant. D. Bellante Holand noted that the dates on the application did not include the consultant, it was just to set up the committee, do the introduction and to familiarize them with the work they've done.

C. Alexander wanted to discuss some of the questions in the application, which she felt may be inappropriate. D. Bellante Holand referred the Board to the statement "English as my second language". C. Alexander recommended eliminating the statement. Board members agreed.

Board members were asked to email their additional comments or edits to D. Bellante Holand by Sunday. They were also asked to look at the Survey for Master Plan Steering Committee Members for comments and edits and information about the administrative position for \$15,000.00. She felt they had to develop a job description.

E. Miller asked what they envisioned the person filling the position was going to do. D. Bellante Holand thought they would benefit from a Master Plan Project Manager, who would be taking minutes, facilitating the consultants, and doing all of the master planning administration. She mentioned that they had \$15,000.00 available for this position until June 30, 2022 and \$15,000.00 for next fiscal year. Depending on the wage (\$40.00), they could hire someone 20 hours a week for this project.

B. Robinson thought the person could be the primary point of contact for the steering committee, and envisioned the person essentially being a jack or jill of all trades to facilitate the master planning process. D. Bellante Holand thought the person could also help the steering committee. B. Robinson agreed and felt that it could be more than just one person. D. Bellante Holand offered to draft a job description for the Board's review. She thought the Board could start reaching out to individuals they believe may serve in that capacity as they refine the job description.

D. Bellante Holand asked Board members for additional descriptors to modify the qualifications and preferences for the ideal steering committee candidates. B. Robinson thought they had to make the time commitment, have connections to the community and be enthusiastic. C. Alexander concurred and added "collaborative". D. Bellante Holand inquired about the specific skill sets (professional or hard skills). B. Robinson did not think it was necessary to have a particular set of skills since they were relying on their consultants. They were not looking to the committee members to do a peer review. E. Miller explained that they were looking for individuals who had a cultural attachment and commitment for the town. D. Bellante Holand asked C. Doble if she would send her a copy of the list of potential candidates. B. Robinson recommended adding their email addresses.

D. Bellante Holand reported that board staff had contacted H. Rydzewski, IT for assistance is setting up a webpage for the Master Plan, and that she was preparing the text and documents to upload. C. Doble did not think their website was user friendly. She

was concerned that the project would be lost in all layers of content. She noted that the consultant offered to setup a separate webpage and thought they should take her up on the offer. D. Bellante Holand agreed but thought that for the moment they could use the website to solicit volunteers for the steering committee and to start the process. They were having to go as far as they could with what they had to work with and meet with the IT person and the consultant.

2. Upcoming TPB Calendar: Public Hearings, Appointments & Discussions

Board members discussed the need to move forward on the Master Plan project and agreed to meet on 01/12/2022 at 9 AM to discuss the Master Plan Budget and Steering Committee Member application, survey and press release.

B. OLD BUSINESS

1. Tisbury Planning Board Development Guidelines

2. Water Resource Committee

Re: CWMP – Draft Needs Assessment

3. Committee Reports (Updates only)

A. Vision Forum

B. Land Bank Advisory Committee

C. Tisbury Housing Committee

D. Community Preservation Committee

E. Water Resource Committee

F. Sewer Advisory Committee

G. Site Plan Review Board

H. Open Space and Recreation Committee

I. Energy Committee

J. All Island Planning Board

K. Climate Committee

L. Tisbury Waterways Committee

2. Uses requiring a Special Permit

~~A.~~ Main Street Medicinals – E. Miller & D. Bellante

~~B.~~ MV Shipyard – C. Doble

~~C.~~ Tisbury Marine Terminal – B. Robinson

~~D.~~ 4 Beach Road LLC (Educomp) - C. Alexander

~~E.~~ Hinckleys – E. Miller & B. Robinson

~~F.~~ Patrick Lyons – 70 seat Restaurant (Bldg E) – C. Doble & P. Munafo

~~G.~~ Greg Carroll, 5 McClellan Way – B. Robinson

~~H.~~ Jim Feiner – P. Harris

CORRESPONDENCE:

1. Martha's Vineyard Commission

A. Extended Meeting Schedule

Other business not reasonably anticipated 48 hours in advance of meeting

**PRO FORM** Meeting opened, conducted and closed in due form at 8:18 P.M.  
(m/s/c 5/0/0)  
Respectfully submitted;

---

Patricia V. Harris, Secretary

**APPROVAL:** Approved and accepted as official minutes;

---

Date

---

Dawn Bellante-Holand  
Chairman